



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,716	07/25/2003	Kil-Soo Jung	1293.1761	9679
49455	7590	11/14/2005		
STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP 1400 EYE STREET, NW SUITE 300 WASHINGTON, DC 20005			EXAMINER RUTLEDGE, AMELIA L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 11/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/626,716

Applicant(s)

JUNG ET AL.

Examiner

Amelia Rutledge

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-67 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-67 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: original application, filed 07/25/2003.
2. Claims 1-67 are pending. Claims 1, 26, 50, 52, and 67 are independent claims.

Claim Objections

3. A series of singular dependent claims is permissible in which a dependent claim refers to a preceding claim which, in turn, refers to another preceding claim.

A claim which depends from a dependent claim should not be separated by any claim which does not also depend from said dependent claim. It should be kept in mind that a dependent claim may refer to any preceding independent claim. In general, applicant's sequence will not be changed. See MPEP § 608.01(n).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. **Claims 1 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Adams, U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0124100, published September 2002.**

Independent claim 1 cites: *A content reproducing apparatus, comprising: a data storage unit storing and/or reading data; and a presentation engine controlling the data storage unit according to a command program contained in an input markup document.*

Adams teaches an apparatus and method for fast efficient access to and delivery of multimedia information (p. 2, par. 11). Adams teaches a data storage unit in the form of web servers for storing and reading data, and a web browser running interface software (p. 2-3, par. 21-23), compare to *a presentation engine controlling the data storage unit according to a command program contained in an input markup document.*

Independent claim 52 cites: *An information storage medium of a content reproducing apparatus comprising a data storage medium and a decoder, the information storage medium comprising: audio/video (AV) data and a markup document reproducing the AV data, the markup document comprising a command program to control the data storage unit of the content reproducing apparatus.*

Adams teaches an apparatus and method for fast efficient access to and delivery of multimedia information (p. 2, par. 11). Adams teaches a data storage unit in the form of web servers for storing and reading data, and a web browser running interface software (p. 2-3, par. 21-23). Adams teaches AV data and a markup document reproducing the AV data, with a script to control the server embedded in the web page (p. 11012, par. 66-67), compare to *the markup document comprising a command program to control the data storage unit of the content reproducing apparatus.* Adams teaches a decoder for presenting AV data in a web page (p. 11-12, par. 66-67) to generate AV information

Art Unit: 2176

including predetermined target information, for example, synchronizing audio with animated visuals that appear on a web page (par. 67).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 2-51 and 53-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams, as applied to claims 1 above, and further in view of Wagner, U.S. Patent No. 6,085,224, issued July 2000.**

Regarding dependent claim 2, Adams teaches a web browser with interface software (p. 2-3, par. 22-23). It was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention that a web browser was a presentation engine with a parser verifying the syntax of a markup document, with a DOM tree forming unit to interpret the structure. While Adams does not explicitly teach extracting the command program and an interpreter receiving the extracted command program from the DOM tree forming unit to control the data storage unit, Wagner teaches using an interpreter for extracting a command program from the DOM tree to control the data storage unit, i.e., server, and generating a cookie of the information (Col. 6, l. 9-51). Both Adams and Wagner are directed toward web content delivery. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Wagner to Adams, so that Adams

Art Unit: 2176

would have the benefit of a program which would notify the user of detected interpretive programs and cookie commands without modifying the browser program (Wagner, Col. 4, l. 4-9).

Regarding dependent claim 3, Adams teaches a command program written in a script language (p. 12-13, par. 72).

Regarding dependent claim 4, while Adams teaches the use of cookie information, Adams does not explicitly teach the generation of cookie information comprising predetermined target information. However, Wagner teaches the generation of cookie information containing a predefined action map (Col. 6, l. 9-51). Wagner teaches that the generated cookie information is generated at the browser and stored in the server (Col. 14, l. 44-Col. 15, l. 20), compare to: *the presentation engine generates cookie information comprising predetermined target information and stores the cookie information in the data storage unit*. Both Adams and Wagner are directed toward web content delivery. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Wagner to Adams, so that Adams would have the benefit of a program which would notify the user of detected interpretive programs and cookie commands without modifying the browser program (Wagner, Col. 4, l. 4-9).

Regarding dependent claim 5, while Adams does not explicitly teach these limitations, Wagner teaches a configuration file to store the cookie data (Col. 14, l. 44-Col. 15, l. 20), compare to claim 5, *a non-volatile data storage portion*. Wagner teaches that cookie data is also stored in the HTTP header, which is volatile data storage. Both Adams and Wagner are directed toward web content delivery. It would have been

Art Unit: 2176

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Wagner to Adams, so that Adams would have the benefit of a program which would notify the user of detected interpretive programs and cookie commands without modifying the browser program (Wagner, Col. 4, l. 4-9).

Regarding dependent claims 6 and 7, Adams teaches using a cookie to identify a user and identify content appropriate to the user and/or targeted content, i.e., content identification information (p. 31, par. 186, 187). While Adams does not explicitly teach incorporating content identification information into the cookie information, Wagner teaches the use of cookies to record information for later search and reading. Both Adams and Wagner are directed toward web content delivery. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Wagner to Adams, so that Adams would have the benefit of a program which would notify the user of detected interpretive programs and cookie commands without modifying the browser program (Wagner, Col. 4, l. 4-9).

Regarding dependent claims 8 and 9, while Adams teaches a command program (p. 12-13, par. 72), Adams does not explicitly teach the use of a decoder, Wagner teaches a command program and a decoding process to read predetermined target information in the form of trigger events, storing the trigger events in a log file on the server (Col. 16, l. 48-Col. 17, l. 21). Wagner teaches using an interpreter for extracting a command program from the DOM tree to control the data storage unit, i.e., server, and generating a cookie of the information (Col. 6, l. 9-51). Both Adams and Wagner are directed toward web content delivery. It would have been obvious to one of

Art Unit: 2176

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Wagner to Adams, so that Adams would have the benefit of a program which would notify the user of detected interpretive programs and cookie commands without modifying the browser program (Wagner, Col. 4, l. 4-9).

Regarding dependent claim 10, Adams teaches that the browser receives data generated by a user and a user ID is generated, and a web server returns the ID to a user's browser in the form of a cookie (p. 4-5, par. 38). It was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention that user IDs were stored on the server. Compare to claim 10, *the presentation engine receives data from a user, and the command program is a command program which commands that the cookie information comprising predetermined target information in the input data from the user be generated, and commands the generated cookie information be stored in the data storage unit.*

Regarding dependent claim 11, while Adams does not explicitly teach a cookie reference command program, Wagner teaches a command program to search and extract configuration data, i.e., predetermined target information, from the generated cookie (Col. 14, l. 44-Col. 15, l. 20), compare to: *the presentation engine searches the data storage unit for at least one cookie information item, and extracts the predetermined target information from the at least one cookie information item.* Both Adams and Wagner are directed toward web content delivery. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Wagner to Adams, so that Adams would have the benefit of a program which would notify the user

Art Unit: 2176

of detected interpretive programs and cookie commands without modifying the browser program (Wagner, Col. 4, l. 4-9).

Regarding dependent claim 12, while Adams does not explicitly teach cookie deletion, Wagner teaches the disabling of cookie data in script commands (Col. 13, l. 5-26) as well as the deletion of cookie information (Col. 12, l. 6-13). Wagner teaches a delete cookie programmatic command (Fig. 2). Further, scripting programs for the removal or deletion of cookies were notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention. Both Adams and Wagner are directed toward web content delivery. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Wagner to Adams, so that Adams would have the benefit of a program which would notify the user of detected interpretive programs and cookie commands without modifying the browser program (Wagner, Col. 4, l. 4-9).

Regarding dependent claim 13, Adams teaches web server add in components to deliver content defining a content reproducing apparatus, such as a web browser, to track connection states for each user (p. 10, par. 60 - p. 11, par. 61). While Adams does not explicitly teach that the cookie information contains information indicating a path of a markup document using the target information, and the target information comprises a name identifying the target information and a value of the target information, the practice of indicating a path of a markup document in a cookie was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention. Wagner teaches a path of a markup document in the form of a URL and a name and value for target information such as URLs or scripts (Col. 15, l. 41-Col. 16, l. 34). Both Adams and Wagner are

Art Unit: 2176

directed toward web content delivery. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Wagner to Adams, so that Adams would have the benefit of a program which would notify the user of detected interpretive programs and cookie commands without modifying the browser program (Wagner, Col. 4, l. 4-9).

Regarding dependent claims 14-21, claims 14-21 are directed toward substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 13, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 22, Adams teaches an expiration date and time of static files (p. 34, par. 217), and it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention that cookie files contained a method to set an expiration date for cookie information. Compare to claim 22, *wherein the cookie information further comprises third information defining a duration of the cookie information.*

Regarding dependent claims 23-25, while Adams does not explicitly teach the method of overwriting cookie information claimed in claim 23, Adams does teach the dynamic generation of content in response to a query (p. 14, par. 85), compare to *wherein if cookie information having the same first information and second information, and the same name to identify the target information as the cookie information generated according to the cookie generation command program exists in the data storage unit, the presentation engine overwrites the cookie information in the data storage unit with the generated cookie information.* While Adams teaches overwriting page data rather than cookie data, Wagner teaches that when a site is visited, any

Art Unit: 2176

subsequent communication with a server site causes the system to determine the cookie data which has been defined for the site and use the data values for scanning the data stream (Col. 6, l. 39-51). Both Adams and Wagner are directed toward web content delivery. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Wagner to Adams, so that Adams would have the benefit of a program which would notify the user of detected interpretive programs and cookie commands without modifying the browser program (Wagner, Col. 4, l. 4-9).

Independent claim 26 cites: *A content reproducing method, comprising: receiving a markup document comprising a predetermined command program; parsing to verify a syntax of the markup document; extracting the command program by interpreting a structure of the markup document; and controlling a data storage unit according to the command program.*

Adams teaches a method for fast efficient access to and delivery of multimedia information (p. 2, par. 11). Adams teaches a data storage unit in the form of web servers for storing and reading data, and a web browser running interface software (p. 2-3, par. 21-23). Adams teaches the use of scripts in web pages, compare to *receiving a markup document comprising a predetermined command program*. Adams teaches a web browser with interface software (p. 2-3, par. 22-23). It was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention that a web browser was a presentation engine with a parser verifying the syntax of a markup document, with a DOM tree forming unit to interpret the structure. While Adams does not explicitly teach extracting the command program and an interpreter receiving the extracted command program from the DOM

Art Unit: 2176

tree forming unit to control the data storage unit, Wagner teaches using an interpreter for extracting a command program from the DOM tree to control the data storage unit, i.e., server, and generating a cookie of the information (Col. 6, l. 9-51). Both Adams and Wagner are directed toward web content delivery. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Wagner to Adams, so that Adams would have the benefit of a program which would notify the user of detected interpretive programs and cookie commands without modifying the browser program (Wagner, Col. 4, l. 4-9).

Regarding dependent claims 27-30, claims 27-30 are directed toward substantially similar subject matter as claimed in dependent claims 3-6, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 31, Adams teaches fetching predetermined target information from a decoder decoding AV data, for example a web server add in component scans a page request to determine if any AV keywords are embedded (p. 11, par. 63-65).

Regarding dependent claim 32, claim 32 is directed toward substantially similar subject matter as claimed in dependent claim 9, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 33, Adams teaches that the browser receives data generated by a user and a user ID is generated, and a web server returns the ID to a user's browser in the form of a cookie (p. 4-5, par. 38). It was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention that user IDs were stored on the server.

Regarding dependent claims 34 and 35, claims 34 and 35 are directed toward substantially similar subject matter as claimed in dependent claims 11 and 12, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claims 36-45, claims 36-45 are directed toward substantially similar subject matter as claimed in dependent claim 13, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claims 46-49, claims 46-49 are directed toward substantially similar subject matter as claimed in dependent claims 22-25, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Independent claim 50 cites: *A content reproducing method of a data storage unit, comprising: receiving content; searching for cookie information with content identification information that matches identification information in the received content; and reading predetermined target information in the cookie information.*

Adams teaches using a cookie to identify a user and identify content appropriate to the user and/or targeted content, i.e., content identification information (p. 31, par. 186, 187). While Adams does not explicitly teach incorporating content identification information into the cookie information, Wagner teaches the use of cookies to record information for later search and reading and to search for identification information in the page content. Both Adams and Wagner are directed toward web content delivery. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Wagner to Adams, so that Adams would have the benefit of a program which

Art Unit: 2176

would notify the user of detected interpretive programs and cookie commands without modifying the browser program (Wagner, Col. 4, l. 4-9).

Regarding dependent claim 51, Adams teaches using a cookie to identify a user and identify content appropriate to the user and/or targeted content, i.e., content identification information (p. 31, par. 186, 187). While Adams does not explicitly teach incorporating content identification information into the cookie information, Wagner teaches the use of cookies to record information for later search and reading. Wagner also teaches a configuration file to store the cookie data (Col. 14, l. 44-Col. 15, l. 20), compare to a *non-volatile data storage portion*. Wagner teaches that cookie data is also stored in the HTTP header, which is volatile data storage. Wagner teaches that the cookies are stored in the configuration file according to an attribute value in the command program. Both Adams and Wagner are directed toward web content delivery. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Wagner to Adams, so that Adams would have the benefit of a program which would notify the user of detected interpretive programs and cookie commands without modifying the browser program (Wagner, Col. 4, l. 4-9).

Regarding dependent claims 53-56, claims 53-56 reflect substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 6, 3, 5, and 8, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 57, Adams teaches using a cookie to identify a user and identify content appropriate to the user and/or targeted content, i.e., content identification information (p. 31, par. 186, 187). While Adams does not explicitly teach

Art Unit: 2176

incorporating content identification information into the cookie information, Wagner teaches the use of cookies to record information for later search and reading. Both Adams and Wagner are directed toward web content delivery. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Wagner to Adams, so that Adams would have the benefit of a program which would notify the user of detected interpretive programs and cookie commands without modifying the browser program (Wagner, Col. 4, l. 4-9). Compare to: *wherein the cookie generation command program performs a control so that the content reproducing apparatus generates cookie information comprising content identification information and stores the cookie information in the data storage unit.*

Regarding dependent claim 58, Adams teaches using a cookie to identify a user and identify content appropriate to the user and/or targeted content, i.e., content identification information (p. 31, par. 186, 187). Adams teaches a decoder for presenting AV data in a web page (p. 11-12, par. 66-67) to generate AV information including predetermined target information, for example, synchronizing audio with animated visuals that appear on a web page (par. 67). While Adams does not explicitly teach incorporating content identification information or AV information into the cookie information, Wagner teaches the use of cookies to record information for later search and reading. Both Adams and Wagner are directed toward web content delivery. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Wagner to Adams, so that Adams would have the benefit of a

program which would notify the user of detected interpretive programs and cookie commands without modifying the browser program (Wagner, Col. 4, l. 4-9).

Regarding dependent claim 59, while Adams teaches the use of cookie information, Adams does not explicitly teach the generation of cookie information comprising predetermined target information. However, Wagner teaches the generation of cookie information containing a predefined action map (Col. 6, l. 9-51). Wagner teaches that the generated cookie information is generated at the browser and stored in the server (Col. 14, l. 44-Col. 15, l. 20), compare to: *the content reproducing apparatus generates cookie information comprising predetermined target information in the markup document*. Both Adams and Wagner are directed toward web content delivery. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Wagner to Adams, so that Adams would have the benefit of a program which would notify the user of detected interpretive programs and cookie commands without modifying the browser program (Wagner, Col. 4, l. 4-9).

Regarding dependent claims 60-64, claims 60-64 are directed to substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 10, and 11-13, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 65, Adams teaches web server add in components to deliver content defining a content reproducing apparatus, such as a web browser, to track connection states for each user (p. 10, par. 60 - p. 11, par. 61). While Adams does not explicitly teach that the cookie information contains information indicating a path of a markup document using the target information, and the target information

Art Unit: 2176

comprises a name identifying the target information and a value of the target information, the practice of indicating a path of a markup document in a cookie was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention. Wagner teaches a path of a markup document in the form of a URL and a name and value for target information such as URLs or scripts (Col. 15, l. 41-Col. 16, l. 34).

While Adams does not explicitly teach a cookie reference command program, Wagner teaches a command program to search and extract configuration data, i.e., predetermined target information, from the generated cookie (Col. 14, l. 44-Col. 15, l. 20), compare to: *the cookie reference command program performs control to search for the cookie information having the same first information, second information, and the name identifying the target information as in the cookie reference command program and to extract the value of the target information.*

Both Adams and Wagner are directed toward web content delivery. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Wagner to Adams, so that Adams would have the benefit of a program which would notify the user of detected interpretive programs and cookie commands without modifying the browser program (Wagner, Col. 4, l. 4-9).

Regarding dependent claim 66, the limitations of claim 66 are substantially similar to those of dependent claim 65, except for the limitation: *the cookie deletion command program performs control to search for the cookie information having the same first information, second information, and the name identifying the target information as in the command program and to delete the searched cookie information.*

Art Unit: 2176

While Adams teaches expires and cache-control headers to indicate for how long AV content is valid, using server components (p. 32, par. 199), Adams does not explicitly teach cookie deletion programs. However, scripting programs for the removal or deletion of cookies were notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention. Wagner teaches a delete cookie programmatic command (Fig. 2). Both Adams and Wagner are directed toward web content delivery. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Wagner to Adams, so that Adams would have the benefit of a program which would notify the user of detected interpretive programs and cookie commands without modifying the browser program (Wagner, Col. 4, l. 4-9).

Independent claim 67 cites: *A computer readable medium of a data storage unit having embodied thereon a program for a content reproducing method, comprising: receiving a markup document comprising a predetermined command program; parsing to verify a syntax of the markup document; extracting the command program by interpreting a structure of the markup document; and controlling the data storage unit according to the command program.*

Adams teaches an apparatus and method for fast efficient access to and delivery of multimedia information (p. 2, par. 11). Adams teaches a data storage unit in the form of web servers for storing and reading data, and a web browser running interface software (p. 2-3, par. 21-23). It was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention that a web browser was a presentation engine with a parser verifying the syntax of a markup document, with a DOM tree forming unit to interpret the structure. While Adams

Art Unit: 2176

does not explicitly teach extracting the command program and an interpreter receiving the extracted command program from the DOM tree forming unit to control the data storage unit, Wagner teaches using an interpreter for extracting a command program from the DOM tree to control the data storage unit, i.e., server, and generating a cookie of the information (Col. 6, l. 9-51). Both Adams and Wagner are directed toward web content delivery. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Wagner to Adams, so that Adams would have the benefit of a program which would notify the user of detected interpretive programs and cookie commands without modifying the browser program (Wagner, Col. 4, l. 4-9).

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Franco U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0046407 published April 2002

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amelia Rutledge whose telephone number is 571-272-7508. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:30 - 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AR

William L. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
11/9/2005